



Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: Smith et al., 4,595,899 and Frese et al., 5,814,993 and the fact that these references show cylindrical-spheres as a main enclosure, with two-dimensional repositioning. Neither of these references has a spherical enclosure (i.e. a 3-dimensional circular enclosure) and neither teach or show three-dimensional repositioning..

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's attorney to discuss the examiner's amendment to be entered, which was authorized by Attorney Larry Nixon on July 7th 2004 in order to place the application in condition for allowance. Specifically discussed with attorney Updeep Gil was where and how applicant wanted new dependent claim 15, of the May 17th 2004 amendment and response, incorporated into the independent claims, by examiner's amendment, since incorporating new claim 15 into the independent claims, would distinguish applicant's MRI system / method/ apparatus from the prior art of record. Additionally, the examiner proposed correcting minor antecedent grammatical corrections, and a more descriptive title for the application. The attorney approved the examiner proposed changes and thanked the examiner for her time..